LAND APPLICATION OF BIOSOLIDS SITE INSPECTION FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION	DATE: 12 January 20	004			
COUNTY: Loudoun CONTRACTOR/MUNICIPALITY: Synagro					
NAME (OWNER/OPERATOR): farmer Charles Athey; landowner Nancy O'Conner					
INSPECTED BY: Charlie S	PERMIT NO: VDHBUR 63	ERMIT NO: VDHBUR 63			
FIELD NO: 27-7		ACRES: 65.0			
OTHERS PRESENT: Kelly Love, Gary Garner with Synagro; Alex Blackburn, Jerry Franklin with Loudoun Co.					
FIELD DATA/OBSERVATI	TIME: 1:00 p.m.				
WEATHER: 50's	SOIL CONDITIONS: ok				
BIOSOLIDS SOURCE:	BIOSOLIDS TYPE: cake-lime stabilized				
SOIL pH: 6.0 pH	SOLIDS CONTENT OF BIOSOLIDS (%): 23.80%				
APPLICATION RATE: 4.7 dry tons per acre equals 113 pounds P.A.N. per acre					
CROP AND EXPECTED YIELD: hay					
LOAD TO DATE (WT): 1284 wet tons- field completed					
BIOSOLIDS APPLIED: () LIQUID (XX) DEWATERED					
MODE OF APPLICATION: (X)SURFACE ()SURFACE W/INCORP. ()INJECTION					N
APPLICATION LIMITED (XX) NITROGEN () pH					
BY:					
	() MAX. HYDRAULIC LOADING (LIQUID BIOSOLIDS)				
() MAX. SOLIDS LOADING (15 DRY TONS/ACRE)					
() OTHER (SPECIFY):					
FIELD OBSERVATIONS				<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
BUFFERS OBSERVED:			XX		
UNIFORM APPLICATION:				XX	
PROPER FIELD RECORDS:			XX		
SIGNS OF RUNOFF:			XX		
TRUCKS NON-SPILL/WATERTIGHT:			NOT	OBSER	
				VED	
	CONDITION OF HAU	JL ROUTE SATISFACTORY:		XX	
ODORS PRESENT:	(XX) NONE	() NORMAL TO LESS) ABOVE	
			NC	RMAL*	
OVERALL CONDITION OF	SITE: \(\frac{1}{2}\)(\(\text{XX}\)\) GOOF) () FAIR	1) POOR	

COMMENTS: (*explain):

This was a complaint inspection. The complaint had originated from the Loudoun County Health Department in late December 2003, concerning land application over areas they identified as sinkholes. This is a fairly large farm with a couple of hundred acres. The farm had been completed in November and operations were finished at this location. The land application operation appeared normal and the odors at this time non-existent. Blue Plains biosolids had been land applied. Mr. Athev's fields of hay had a good stand of vegetation present. Only one field was the location of the complaints even though four fields had been spread. The author of this report was shown the first two identified "sinkholes" but could not recognize the depressions as sinkholes at all. They were very small with only a foot or so of elevation difference between the center and the edge. Biosolids had been scraped from one of these features. As these depressions were not easily determined to be sinkholes, the County assertions of non-compliance could not be substantiated. The author did state that the operations may not justify a violation notice or enforcement actions, due to the lack of specifics for designating sinkholes and the small areas involved.

The last area of concern involved a larger depression located on the top of a rise within the field. This area did appear to be an inactive sinkhole. Land application operations were located within this area. However, there was no visible outlet for rainwater to drain into the subsurface (such as an opening or rock ledge). The center of the area could be accessed by farm vehicles. Any permit restrictions for operations on the area would have to be discussed with the Director of Wastewater Engineering and it was requested that the County contact DWE via email. No limestone rock formations were observed within this landscape feature. Synagro had agreed to remove biosolids from this area of the field. An agreement on identification of sinkhole features would be needed for future land application operations.

COPIES:

VDH - Div of Wastewater Engineering County Health Department County Administrator Synagro, Inc.